

|                                             |                        |                     |  |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                                             | 10/770,941             | COBBLEY ET AL.      |  |
|                                             | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                                             | David S. Blum          | 2813                |  |

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** inal rejection

(1) David S. Blum.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Robert Manware.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 16 March 2005

**Time:** 4:00PM

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

102/inherency

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

explained reasoning for inherency

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)